

Altmann Oliver Associates, LLC

AOA



PO Box 578

Carnation, WA 98014

Office (425) 333-4535

Fax (425) 333-4509

Environmental
Planning &
Landscape
Architecture

Wetland and Wildlife Study

for

TALL CHIEF GOLF COURSE King County, Washington

Prepared for:

Tall Chief Golf, Inc.
c/o Lang Associates, Inc.
10658 Riviera Place NE
Seattle, WA 98125

Prepared by:

Altmann Oliver Associates, LLC
PO Box 578
Carnation, Washington 98014

December 20, 2004

L04P0004

Table Of Contents

	Page
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
2.0 GENERAL PROPERTY DESCRIPTION AND LAND USE	1
3.0 METHODOLOGY	1
4.0 RESULTS	2
5.0 DEVELOPMENT IMPACTS ON WETLANDS	4
6.0 MITIGATION FOR WETLAND IMPACTS	4
7.0 WILDLIFE	5
7.1 Results	5
7.2 Threatened and Endangered Species and Habitats	6

References

List of Drawings

Drawing 1: Wetland Map

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Wetland Data Sheets

TALL CHIEF GOLF & COUNTRY CLUB KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON WETLAND AND WILDLIFE STUDY

December 20, 2004

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report documents the results of a wetland delineation and wildlife habitat assessment that was conducted on the approximately 205-acre Tall Chief Golf Course property located at 1313 W. Snoqualmie River Road SE in the Fall City area of King County (**Drawing 1**). The site is found in the east half of Section 5, Township 24 North, Range 7 East, W.M., and includes Lots 052407-9002, 052407-9025, and 052407-9026.

The purpose of this report is to: 1) describe the wetlands and wildlife habitats identified on the property, 2) identify conceptual impacts to wetland resources from the proposed development, and 3) describe the conceptual measures that could be implemented to mitigate for wetland impacts.

2.0 GENERAL PROPERTY DESCRIPTION AND LAND USE

The site is currently developed with an existing 18-hole golf course and associated clubhouse that occupy the majority of Lot 052407-9002. The southwestern portion of the site (i.e., Lots -9025 and -9026) as well as the western portion of Lot -9002 are undeveloped and consist primarily of an east-facing slope dominated by an unevenly aged mixed forest. A large north-draining wetland system occupies much of the central portion of Lot -9002 and extends off-site to the south and north. In addition, much of the golf course area in the northeast portion of the site is located within the floodplain of the Snoqualmie River, which is found off-site to the east.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

A general site reconnaissance was conducted on November 12th and 22nd, 2003 (following a significant flooding event) to gain an overall impression of the existing environment. Observations were made of the general plant communities, wildlife habitats, and the locations of potential wetland areas. Present and past land use practices were also noted, as were significant geological and hydrological features. The wetland delineation was subsequently conducted in the fall of 2004 utilizing the methodology outlined in the *Washington State Wetlands Identification and Delineation Manual* (1997). Site visits were conducted on October 14, 18, 19, 21, 28, November 1, 3, and December 15, 2004.

Plant species were identified according to the taxonomy of Hitchcock and Cronquist (1973), and the wetland status of plant species was assigned according to the *List of Plant Species that Occur in Wetlands*, published by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Reed 1988, 1993). Wetland classes were determined by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's system of wetland classification (Cowardin, *et. al.* 1979).

Vegetation was considered hydrophytic if greater than 50% of the dominant plant species had a wetland indicator status of facultative or wetter (i.e., facultative, facultative wetland, or obligate wetland). Soil on the site was considered hydric if one or more of the following characteristics were present:

- organic soils or soils with an organic surface layer,
- matrix chroma just below the A-horizon (or 10 inches, whichever is less) of 1 or less in unmottled soils, or 2 or less if mottles were present, or
- gleying immediately below the A-horizon.

Indicators of wetland hydrology included, but were not necessarily limited to: drainage patterns, drift lines, sediment deposition, watermarks, and visual observation or evidence of inundation or saturated soils.

An evaluation of the vegetation, soils and hydrology was made at various locations along the interface of wetland and upland. Wetland boundary points were then determined from this information. Wetland boundaries were marked with flagging and surveyed. **Appendix A** contains data sheets prepared for representative locations in both the uplands and wetlands. These data sheets document the vegetation, soils, and hydrology information that aided in the wetland boundary determination.

4.0 RESULTS

Nine wetland areas (Wetland Areas A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, and I) and one small stream (Stream 1) were delineated on the property (**Drawing 1**). Each of these sensitive areas is described below.

Wetland A

Wetland A is located along the southeast property line and extends into the site to the southeast of the existing clubhouse. The wetland is part of a larger wetland that is located off-site to the east. Vegetation within the main on-site portion of the wetland consisted of a palustrine scrub-shrub plant community dominated by willow (*Salix* sp.), with spirea (*Spiraea douglasii*), red-osier dogwood (*Cornus sericea*), and reed canarygrass (*Phalaris arundinacea*) also being common. In addition, a strip of palustrine forested vegetation was located along the west edge of the entire wetland (both on and off-site). This strip corresponded roughly with the toe of the adjacent upland forested slope and included western red cedar (*Thuja plicata*), big-leaf maple (*Acer macrophyllum*), vine maple (*Acer circinatum*), salmonberry (*Rubus spectabilis*), stinging nettle (*Urtica dioica*), skunk cabbage (*Lysichitum americanum*), slough sedge (*Carex obnupta*), and lady fern (*Athyrium filix-femina*). Vegetation within the main off-site portion of the wetland was dominated primarily by a monotypic reed canarygrass pasture.

At the time of the Fall 2004 field investigations, soils throughout the wetland were saturated to the surface and portions of the wetland contained up to six inches of ponding. Runoff within the wetland generally drains from south to north.

Wetland A appears to meet the definition of a Class 2 wetland according to King County Code since it is greater than one acre in size. Class 2 wetlands currently require a standard 50-foot buffer plus a 15-foot building setback.

Wetland B

Wetland B is located in the vicinity of proposed Lot 7 in the southeastern portion of the site. The wetland is located within a topographic depression in the existing golf course and is separated from Wetland A via a cart path. A culvert located under the cart path provides a high-flow hydrologic connection to a finger of Wetland A that extends onto the site. Vegetation within the wetland consisted primarily of a palustrine scrub-shrub plant community that included vine maple, salmonberry, Himalayan blackberry (*Rubus discolor*), giant horsetail (*Equisetum telmateia*), youth-on-age (*Tolmiea menziesii*), skunk cabbage, slough sedge, lady fern, and young red alder (*Alnus rubra*). At the time of the field investigations, soils within the wetland were generally saturated to the surface.

Wetland B would likely be considered a Class 2 wetland according to King County Code since it appears to have had a hydric soil connection to Wetland A prior to historic filling for the cart path and currently has a high flow connection via a culvert. Class 2 wetlands currently require a standard 50-foot buffer plus a 15-foot building setback.

Wetlands C, D, E, and F

Wetlands C, D, E, and F are located within the golf course in the north-central portion of the site, along the western edge of the floodplain for the Snoqualmie River. The wetlands are all hydrologically connected via culverts located under portions of the course and the existing access road. Most of these wetland areas have been heavily disturbed through historic grading associated with the golf course construction. Soils were generally saturated to the surface within all wetland areas during the field investigations.

Wetland C consisted primarily of a manicured lawn and associated water feature with reed canarygrass, smartweed (*Polygonum persicaria*), and a row of weeping willow (*Salix babylonica*) trees along the edge. The northern portion of Wetland D contained a palustrine forested and emergent plant community that included black cottonwood (*Populus trichocarpa*), Pacific willow (*Salix lasiandra*), red alder, red-osier dogwood, black twinberry (*Lonicera involucrata*), Himalayan blackberry, reed canarygrass, and slough sedge. The southern portion of Wetland D consisted primarily of manicured lawn and open water golf course ponds.

Wetlands E and F are located north of the existing access drive. Wetland E consisted of a golf course pond and palustrine scrub-shrub plant community dominated by willow and reed canarygrass. Wetland F was dominated by reed canarygrass with scattered clumps of willow, young red alder, Himalayan blackberry, black twinberry, lady fern and skunk cabbage. This wetland area is part of a larger wetland that extends off-site to the north.

Wetland areas C, D, E, and F would likely all be considered Class 2 wetlands according to King County Code since they appear to be part of a wetland system that is greater than one acre in size. The wetlands would likely not be considered Class 1 since the open water components of the wetlands appear to be primarily artificial. Class 2 wetlands currently require a standard 50-foot buffer plus a 15-foot building setback.

Wetlands G, H and I

Wetlands G, H, and I are located in the northwestern portion of the site. These wetlands all consist of seeps along the hillside. Vegetation within the wetlands was dominated by palustrine forested plant communities that included big-leaf maple, western red cedar, western hemlock (*Tsuga heterophylla*), red alder, vine maple, salmonberry, lady fern, skunk cabbage, and youth-on-age. Soils were generally saturated to the surface during the field investigations.

Wetlands H and I would likely be considered Class 2 wetlands according to King County Code since they are greater than 2,500 s.f. in size and contain a forested wetland class. Wetland G would likely be a Class 3 wetland since it is less than 2,500 s.f. in size. Class 2 wetlands currently require a standard 50-foot buffer plus a 15-foot building setback and Class 3 wetlands currently require a standard 25-foot buffer plus 15-foot building setback.

Stream 1

Stream 1 is located in the southeastern portion of the site. The stream channel is intermittent, eroded, and has an average width of about three feet. Runoff within the channel appears to go subsurface in places. Vegetation within the riparian corridor of the stream was dominated by red alder, Himalayan blackberry, salmonberry, and stinging nettle.

Stream 1 would currently be considered a Class 3 stream by King County since it is intermittent and does not contain salmonid habitat. Class 3 streams currently require a standard 25-foot buffer (plus 15-foot building setback) from the ordinary high water line.

5.0 DEVELOPMENT IMPACTS ON WETLANDS

The proposed residential project has been designed to avoid impacts to wetlands and their buffers (**Drawing 1**). The only potentially unavoidable wetland and/or buffer impacts would occur through road improvements and include: 1) widening of the existing access road between Wetlands D and E, 2) construction of the new access road in the vicinity of the cart path crossing between Wetlands A and B, and 3) improvements to the existing gravel road in the northwest portion of the site for use as an emergency access. All of the remaining wetland and buffer areas on the site would be preserved.

? Not feasible

6.0 MITIGATION FOR WETLAND IMPACTS

Potential wetland/buffer impacts associated with the road improvements are anticipated to be relatively minor. Mitigation for these impacts, if necessary, would occur through a combination of wetland buffer averaging and replacement of

additional high value buffer areas as appropriate. Due to the likely small amount of wetland/buffer impact, it was determined that protecting additional forested buffer habitat was potentially the best mitigation option. If wetland impacts were larger than anticipated, then on-site wetland creation and/or enhancement would be reviewed.

7.0 WILDLIFE

Wildlife habitats on the site were reviewed during the field investigations.

7.1 Results

Wildlife habitats on the site consisted primarily of the following:

- 1) Unevenly aged mixed upland forest. This habitat type is found throughout the western portion of the site, associated with the east-facing slope. Vegetation included a nearly closed canopy of unevenly aged western red cedar, big-leaf maple, Douglas fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*), western hemlock, and red alder. Many trees were larger than 24" diameter at breast height (dbh), with mature trees common. Understory vegetation varied from open to moderately dense and included sword fern (*Polystichum munitum*), vine maple, salal (*Gaultheria shallon*), tall Oregon grape (*Mahonia aquifolium*), Indian plum (*Oemleria cerasiformis*), red elderberry (*Sambucus racemosa*), and hazelnut (*Corylus cornuta*). Habitat features such as snags and downed logs were also common.
- 2) Golf Course. This habitat type occupies most of the site and is found throughout the northeastern, north-central, and southeastern portions of the property. In general, this habitat consisted of manicured lawn with scattered trees and tree lines that included pines (*Pinus* sp.), poplars (*Populus* sp.), big-leaf maple, and Douglas fir.
- 3) Mixed Wetlands. This habitat type is found within a band throughout the north-central portion of the site. Vegetation consisted primarily of a scrub-shrub plant community dominated by willow, but also included a variety of smaller forested and emergent components. Also included within this habitat type are several open water ponds associated with the golf course.

A variety of wildlife species typical of rural habitats within the suburban Puget Sound area were observed on the site during the field investigations. However, the number of wildlife species that utilize the site could be expected to be much higher than the number actually observed due to the seasonality and secretive nature of most wildlife species. Bird species observed included the Steller's jay, spotted towhee, winter wren, black-capped chickadee, golden-crowned kinglet, pileated woodpecker (feeding cavities), hairy woodpecker, common raven, American robin, varied thrush, killdeer, mallard, common merganser, hooded merganser, bufflehead, Canada goose, great blue heron, and belted kingfisher. Other observed wildlife species included the black tailed deer, eastern gray squirrel, coyote (scat), Virginia opossum, and Pacific chorus frog.

In addition to the observed species, the project site likely provides habitat for a variety of small mammals such as mice, voles, shrews, bats, weasels, squirrels, and moles that are commonly found within similar habitats. Other mammals that likely utilize the site include the raccoon and mountain beaver, and at least occasionally,

the mountain lion and black bear. Unobserved bird species that likely utilize the property on a regular or occasional basis include the bushtit, dark-eyed junco, rufous hummingbird, brown creeper, northern flicker, black headed grosbeak, Bewick's wren, and a variety of sparrows, warblers, flycatchers, swallows, and nuthatches. Although no raptors or raptor nests were observed during the fall field investigations, the site is probably utilized, at least occasionally, by raptors such as the red-tailed hawk, Cooper's hawk, sharp-shinned hawk, western screech owl, and barred owl. Unobserved reptiles and amphibians that are likely to utilize the site include the garter snake (*Thamnophis* sp.), northern alligator lizard, red legged frog, and a variety of salamanders.

7.2 Threatened and Endangered Species and Habitats

No state endangered, threatened, or sensitive wildlife species or habitats were identified on the during the field investigations.

REFERENCES

- Cowardin, L.M., V. Carter, F.C. Golet, and E.T. LaRoe. 1979. *Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States*. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior. FWSOBS-70/31.
- Ecology, Washington State Department of. 1997. *Washington State Wetlands Identification and Delineation Manual*.
- Environmental Laboratory. 1987. *Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual*. Technical Report Y-87-1, US Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Miss.
- Hitchcock, C.L., and A. Cronquist. 1973. *Flora of the Pacific Northwest*. University of Washington Press. 730 pp.
- Munsell Color. 1988. *Munsell Soil Color Charts*. Kollmorgen Instruments Corp., Baltimore, Maryland.
- Reed, P.B. Jr. 1988. *National List of Plant Species that Occur in Wetlands: Northwest (Region 9)*. USF&WS Biol. Report 88.
- Reed, P.B. Jr. 1993. Supplement to: *National List of Plant Species that Occur in Wetlands: Northwest (Region 9)*. USF&WS Biol. Report 88.

APPENDIX A
DATA SHEETS

DATA FORM
ROUTINE ONSITE DETERMINATION METHOD¹

Field Investigator(s): ALTMANN Date: 10-18-04
Project/Site: TALL CHIEF State: WA County: KING
Applicant/Owner: LANG Plant Community #/Name: TP #1

Note: If a more detailed site description is necessary, use the back of data form or a field notebook.

Do normal environmental conditions exist at the plant community?

Yes X No (If no, explain on back)

Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hydrology been significantly disturbed?

Yes No X (If yes, explain on back)

VEGETATION

Dominant Plant Species	Indicator Status	Stratum	Dominant Plant Species	Indicator Status	Stratum
1. <u>Alnus rubra</u>	<u>FAC</u>	<u>T</u>	11. <u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
2. <u>Rubus spectabilis</u>	<u>FAC+</u>	<u>S</u>	12. <u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
3. <u>Athyrium filix-femina</u>	<u>FAC</u>	<u>H</u>	13. <u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
4. <u>Carex obnupta</u>	<u>OBL</u>	<u>H</u>	14. <u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
5. <u>Lysichitum americanum</u>	<u>OBL</u>	<u>H</u>	15. <u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
6. <u>Ranunculus repens</u>	<u>FACW</u>	<u>H</u>	16. <u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
7. <u>Tolmiea menziesii</u>	<u>FAC</u>	<u>H</u>	17. <u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
8. <u>Equisetum telmateia</u>	<u>FACW</u>	<u>H</u>	18. <u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
9. <u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	19. <u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
10. <u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	20. <u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

Percent of dominant species that are OBL, FACW, and/or FAC 100%

Is the hydrophytic vegetation criterion met? Yes X No

Rationale:

> 50% FAC OR WETTER

SOILS

Series/phase: Subgroup:²

Is the soil on the hydric soils list? Yes No Undetermined

Is the soil a Histosol? Yes No X Histic epipedon present? Yes No X

Is the soil: Mottled? Yes No X Gleyed? Yes No X

Matrix Color: 10B R 2/1 Mottle Colors:

Other hydric soil indicators:

Is the hydric soil criterion met? Yes X No

Rationale:

LOW CHROMA

HYDROLOGY

Is the ground surface inundated? Yes No X Surface water depth:

Is the soil saturated? Yes X No

Depth to free-standing water in pit/soil probe hole: 7"

List other field evidence of surface inundation or soil saturation.

Is the wetland hydrology criterion met? Yes X No

Rationale:

OBSERVATION OF SOIL SATURATION

JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE

Is the plant community a wetland? Yes X No

Rationale for jurisdictional decision:

ALL 3 CRITERIA MET

¹ This data form can be used for the Hydric Soil Assessment Procedure and the Plant Community Assessment Procedure.

² Classification according to "Soil Taxonomy."

DATA FORM
ROUTINE ONSITE DETERMINATION METHOD¹

Field Investigator(s): AUTMANN Date: 10-18-04
Project/Site: TALL CHIEF State: WA County: PING
Applicant/Owner: LANG Plant Community #/Name: _____
Note: If a more detailed site description is necessary, use the back of data form or a field notebook.

Do normal environmental conditions exist at the plant community?

Yes ☒ No _____ (If no, explain on back)

Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hydrology been significantly disturbed?

Yes _____ No ☒ (If yes, explain on back)

VEGETATION

Dominant Plant Species	Indicator Status	Stratum	Dominant Plant Species	Indicator Status	Stratum
1. <u>Acer macrophyllum</u>	<u>FACU</u>	<u>T</u>	11. _____	_____	_____
2. <u>Rubus discolor</u>	<u>FACU</u>	<u>S</u>	12. _____	_____	_____
3. <u>Rubus spectabilis</u>	<u>FACU</u>	<u>S</u>	13. _____	_____	_____
4. _____	_____	_____	14. _____	_____	_____
5. _____	_____	_____	15. _____	_____	_____
6. _____	_____	_____	16. _____	_____	_____
7. _____	_____	_____	17. _____	_____	_____
8. _____	_____	_____	18. _____	_____	_____
9. _____	_____	_____	19. _____	_____	_____
10. _____	_____	_____	20. _____	_____	_____

Percent of dominant species that are OBL, FACW, and/or FAC ~33%

Is the hydrophytic vegetation criterion met? Yes _____ No ☒

Rationale: _____

NOT 75% FAC OR WETTER

SOILS

Series/phase: _____ Subgroup:² _____

Is the soil on the hydric soils list? Yes _____ No _____ Undetermined _____

Is the soil a Histosol? Yes _____ No ☒ Histic epipedon present? Yes _____ No ☒

Is the soil: Mottled? Yes _____ No ☒ Gleyed? Yes _____ No ☒

Matrix Color: 10YR 5/3 Mottle Colors: _____

Other hydric soil indicators: _____

Is the hydric soil criterion met? Yes _____ No ☒

Rationale: _____

HIGH CHROMA

HYDROLOGY

Is the ground surface inundated? Yes _____ No ☒ Surface water depth: _____

Is the soil saturated? Yes _____ No ☒

Depth to free-standing water in pit/soil probe hole: _____

List other field evidence of surface inundation or soil saturation. _____

Is the wetland hydrology criterion met? Yes _____ No ☒

Rationale: _____

NO OBSERVATION OR EVIDENCE OF SOIL SATURATION OR PONDING

JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE

Is the plant community a wetland? Yes _____ No ☒

Rationale for jurisdictional decision: _____

NO CRITERIA MET

¹ This data form can be used for the Hydric Soil Assessment Procedure and the Plant Community Assessment Procedure.

² Classification according to "Soil Taxonomy."

DATA FORM
ROUTINE ONSITE DETERMINATION METHOD¹

Field Investigator(s): ALTMANN Date: 10-18-04
 Project/Site: TALL CHIEF State: WA County: KING
 Applicant/Owner: HANG Plant Community #/Name: _____

Note: If a more detailed site description is necessary, use the back of data form or a field notebook.

Do normal environmental conditions exist at the plant community?

Yes X No _____ (If no, explain on back)

Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hydrology been significantly disturbed?

Yes _____ No X (If yes, explain on back)

VEGETATION

Dominant Plant Species	Indicator Status	Stratum	Dominant Plant Species	Indicator Status	Stratum
1. <u>Salix lasioandra</u>	<u>FACW+</u>	<u>T/S</u>	11. _____	_____	_____
2. <u>Spiraea douglasii</u>	<u>FACW</u>	<u>S</u>	12. _____	_____	_____
3. <u>Cornus sericea</u>	<u>FACW</u>	<u>S</u>	13. _____	_____	_____
4. <u>Urtica dioica</u>	<u>FAC+</u>	<u>H</u>	14. _____	_____	_____
5. <u>Solanum dulcamara</u>	<u>FAC+</u>	<u>✓</u>	15. _____	_____	_____
6. _____	_____	_____	16. _____	_____	_____
7. _____	_____	_____	17. _____	_____	_____
8. _____	_____	_____	18. _____	_____	_____
9. _____	_____	_____	19. _____	_____	_____
10. _____	_____	_____	20. _____	_____	_____

Percent of dominant species that are OBL, FACW, and/or FAC 100 %

Is the hydrophytic vegetation criterion met? Yes X No _____

Rationale: > 50% FAC OR WETTER

SOILS

Series/phase: _____ Subgroup:² _____

Is the soil on the hydric soils list? Yes _____ No _____ Undetermined _____

Is the soil a Histosol? Yes _____ No X Histic epipedon present? Yes _____ No X

Is the soil: Mottled? Yes _____ No X Gleyed? Yes _____ No X

Matrix Color: 10 YR 3/1 Mottle Colors: _____

Other hydric soil indicators: _____

Is the hydric soil criterion met? Yes X No _____

Rationale: LOW CHROMA

HYDROLOGY

Is the ground surface inundated? Yes _____ No X Surface water depth: _____

Is the soil saturated? Yes X No _____

Depth to free-standing water in pit/soil probe hole: 6"

List other field evidence of surface inundation or soil saturation.

Is the wetland hydrology criterion met? Yes X No _____

Rationale: OBSERVATION OF SOIL SATURATION

JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE

Is the plant community a wetland? Yes X No _____

Rationale for jurisdictional decision: ALL 3 CRITERIA MET

¹ This data form can be used for the Hydric Soil Assessment Procedure and the Plant Community Assessment Procedure.

² Classification according to "Soil Taxonomy."

TP#4

DATA FORM
ROUTINE ONSITE DETERMINATION METHOD¹

Field Investigator(s): AUTMANN Date: 10-18-04
Project/Site: TALL CHIEF State: WA County: KING
Applicant/Owner: LANG Plant Community #/Name: _____
Note: If a more detailed site description is necessary, use the back of data form or a field notebook.

Do normal environmental conditions exist at the plant community?
Yes X No _____ (If no, explain on back)
Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hydrology been significantly disturbed?
Yes _____ No X (If yes, explain on back)

VEGETATION

Dominant Plant Species	Indicator Status	Stratum	Dominant Plant Species	Indicator Status	Stratum
1. <u>Alnus rubra</u>	<u>FAC</u>	<u>T</u>	11. _____	_____	_____
2. <u>Corylus cornuta</u>	<u>FACU</u>	<u>B</u>	12. _____	_____	_____
3. <u>Polystichum munitum</u>	<u>FACU</u>	<u>S</u>	13. _____	_____	_____
4. _____	_____	_____	14. _____	_____	_____
5. _____	_____	_____	15. _____	_____	_____
6. _____	_____	_____	16. _____	_____	_____
7. _____	_____	_____	17. _____	_____	_____
8. _____	_____	_____	18. _____	_____	_____
9. _____	_____	_____	19. _____	_____	_____
10. _____	_____	_____	20. _____	_____	_____

Percent of dominant species that are OBL, FACW, and/or FAC 3390
Is the hydrophytic vegetation criterion met? Yes _____ No X
Rationale: NOT > 50% FAC OR WETTER

SOILS

Series/phase: _____ Subgroup:² _____
Is the soil on the hydric soils list? Yes _____ No _____ Undetermined _____
Is the soil a Histosol? Yes _____ No X Histic epipedon present? Yes _____ No X
Is the soil: Mottled? Yes _____ No X Gleyed? Yes _____ No X
Matrix Color: 10YR 9/3 Mottle Colors: _____
Other hydric soil indicators: _____
Is the hydric soil criterion met? Yes _____ No X
Rationale: HIGH CHROMA

HYDROLOGY

Is the ground surface inundated? Yes _____ No X Surface water depth: _____
Is the soil saturated? Yes _____ No X
Depth to free-standing water in pit/soil probe hole: _____
List other field evidence of surface inundation or soil saturation. _____
Is the wetland hydrology criterion met? Yes _____ No X
Rationale: NO OBSERVATION OR EVIDENCE OF SOIL SATURATION OR PONDING

JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE

Is the plant community a wetland? Yes _____ No X
Rationale for jurisdictional decision: NO CRITERIA MET

¹ This data form can be used for the Hydric Soil Assessment Procedure and the Plant Community Assessment Procedure.
² Classification according to "Soil Taxonomy."

DATA FORM
ROUTINE ONSITE DETERMINATION METHOD¹

Field Investigator(s): ALTMANN Date: 10-18-04
 Project/Site: TALL CHIEF State: WA County: FINCH
 Applicant/Owner: LANC Plant Community #/Name: _____
 Note: If a more detailed site description is necessary, use the back of data form or a field notebook.

Do normal environmental conditions exist at the plant community?

Yes X No _____ (If no, explain on back)

Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hydrology been significantly disturbed?

Yes _____ No X (If yes, explain on back)

VEGETATION

Dominant Plant Species	Indicator Status	Stratum	Dominant Plant Species	Indicator Status	Stratum
1. <u>Salix lasiandra</u>	<u>FACW+</u>	<u>T</u>	11. _____	_____	_____
2. <u>Cornus sericea</u>	<u>FACW</u>	<u>S</u>	12. _____	_____	_____
3. <u>Bidens sp.</u>	<u>~ FACW</u>	<u>H</u>	13. _____	_____	_____
4. <u>Athyrium filix-femina</u>	<u>FAC</u>	<u>H</u>	14. _____	_____	_____
5. <u>Urtica dioica</u>	<u>FAC+</u>	<u>H</u>	15. _____	_____	_____
6. <u>Ranunculus repens</u>	<u>FACW</u>	<u>H</u>	16. _____	_____	_____
7. <u>Impatiens</u>	<u>~ FACW</u>	<u>H</u>	17. _____	_____	_____
8. _____	_____	_____	18. _____	_____	_____
9. _____	_____	_____	19. _____	_____	_____
10. _____	_____	_____	20. _____	_____	_____

Percent of dominant species that are OBL, FACW, and/or FAC 100%

Is the hydrophytic vegetation criterion met? Yes X No _____

Rationale: _____

> 50% FAC OF WETTER

SOILS

Series/phase: _____ Subgroup:² _____

Is the soil on the hydric soils list? Yes _____ No _____ Undetermined _____

Is the soil a Histosol? Yes _____ No X Histic epipedon present? Yes _____ No X

Is the soil: Mottled? Yes X No _____ Gleyed? Yes _____ No X

Matrix Color: 10YR 4/1 Mottle Colors: VARIOUS

Other hydric soil indicators: _____

Is the hydric soil criterion met? Yes X No _____

Rationale: _____

LOW CHROMA WITH MOTTLES

HYDROLOGY

Is the ground surface inundated? Yes _____ No X Surface water depth: _____

Is the soil saturated? Yes X No _____

Depth to free-standing water in pit/soil probe hole: SATURATED AT SURFACE, NO WATER IN HOLE

List other field evidence of surface inundation or soil saturation. _____

Is the wetland hydrology criterion met? Yes X No _____

Rationale: _____

OBSERVATION OF SOIL SATURATION

JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE

Is the plant community a wetland? Yes X No _____

Rationale for jurisdictional decision: _____

ALL 3 CRITERIA MET

¹ This data form can be used for the Hydric Soil Assessment Procedure and the Plant Community Assessment Procedure.

² Classification according to "Soil Taxonomy."

DATA FORM
ROUTINE ONSITE DETERMINATION METHOD¹

Field Investigator(s): ALTMANN Date: 10-18-04
 Project/Site: TALL CHIEF State: WA County: FINC
 Applicant/Owner: LANG Plant Community #/Name: _____
 Note: If a more detailed site description is necessary, use the back of data form or a field notebook.

Do normal environmental conditions exist at the plant community?

Yes ☒ No _____ (If no, explain on back)

Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hydrology been significantly disturbed?

Yes ☐ No ☒ (If yes, explain on back)

VEGETATION

Dominant Plant Species	Indicator Status	Stratum	Dominant Plant Species	Indicator Status	Stratum
1. <u>Thuja plicata</u>	<u>FAC</u>	<u>T</u>	11. _____	_____	_____
2. <u>Sambucus racemosa</u>	<u>FACU</u>	<u>S</u>	12. _____	_____	_____
3. <u>Oemleria cerasiformis</u>	<u>FACU</u>	<u>S</u>	13. _____	_____	_____
4. <u>Symphoricarpos albus</u>	<u>FACU</u>	<u>S</u>	14. _____	_____	_____
5. <u>Urtica dioica</u>	<u>FAC+</u>	<u>H</u>	15. _____	_____	_____
6. <u>Tolmiea menziesii</u>	<u>FAC</u>	<u>H</u>	16. _____	_____	_____
7. <u>Polystichum munitum</u>	<u>FACU</u>	<u>S</u>	17. _____	_____	_____
8. _____	_____	_____	18. _____	_____	_____
9. _____	_____	_____	19. _____	_____	_____
10. _____	_____	_____	20. _____	_____	_____

Percent of dominant species that are OBL, FACW, and/or FAC ~43%

Is the hydrophytic vegetation criterion met? Yes _____ No ☒

Rationale: _____

NOT > 50% FAC OR WETTER

SOILS

Series/phase: _____ Subgroup:² _____

Is the soil on the hydric soils list? Yes _____ No _____ Undetermined _____

Is the soil a Histosol? Yes _____ No ☒ Histic epipedon present? Yes _____ No ☒

Is the soil: Mottled? Yes _____ No ☒ Gleyed? Yes _____ No ☒

Matrix Color: 10R 3/3 Mottle Colors: _____

Other hydric soil indicators: _____

Is the hydric soil criterion met? Yes _____ No ☒

Rationale: _____

HIGH CHROMA

HYDROLOGY

Is the ground surface inundated? Yes _____ No ☒ Surface water depth: _____

Is the soil saturated? Yes _____ No ☒

Depth to free-standing water in pit/soil probe hole: _____

List other field evidence of surface inundation or soil saturation. _____

Is the wetland hydrology criterion met? Yes _____ No ☒

Rationale: _____

NO OBSERVATION OR EVIDENCE OF SOIL SATURATION OR PONDING

JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE

Is the plant community a wetland? Yes _____ No _____

Rationale for jurisdictional decision: _____

¹ This data form can be used for the Hydric Soil Assessment Procedure and the Plant Community Assessment Procedure.

² Classification according to "Soil Taxonomy."

DATA FORM
ROUTINE ONSITE DETERMINATION METHOD¹

Field Investigator(s): ACTMANN Date: 11-3-07
 Project/Site: TALL CHIEF State: WA County: KING
 Applicant/Owner: LANG Plant Community #/Name: _____

Note: If a more detailed site description is necessary, use the back of data form or a field notebook.

Do normal environmental conditions exist at the plant community?

Yes ☒ No _____ (If no, explain on back)

Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hydrology been significantly disturbed?

Yes _____ No ☒ (If yes, explain on back)

VEGETATION

Dominant Plant Species	Indicator Status	Stratum	Dominant Plant Species	Indicator Status	Stratum
1. <u>Alnus rubra</u>	<u>FAC</u>	<u>T</u>	11. _____	_____	_____
2. <u>Rubus spectabilis</u>	<u>FAC</u>	<u>S</u>	12. _____	_____	_____
3. <u>Athyrium filix-femina</u>	<u>FAC</u>	<u>H</u>	13. _____	_____	_____
4. <u>Tolmiea menziesii</u>	<u>FAC</u>	<u>H</u>	14. _____	_____	_____
5. <u>Urtica dioica</u>	<u>FAC</u>	<u>H</u>	15. _____	_____	_____
6. _____	_____	_____	16. _____	_____	_____
7. _____	_____	_____	17. _____	_____	_____
8. _____	_____	_____	18. _____	_____	_____
9. _____	_____	_____	19. _____	_____	_____
10. _____	_____	_____	20. _____	_____	_____

Percent of dominant species that are OBL, FACW, and/or FAC 100%

Is the hydrophytic vegetation criterion met? Yes ☒ No _____

Rationale: _____

75% FAC OR BETTER

SOILS

Series/phase: _____ Subgroup:² _____

Is the soil on the hydric soils list? Yes _____ No _____ Undetermined _____

Is the soil a Histosol? Yes _____ No ☒ Histic epipedon present? Yes ☒ No _____

Is the soil: Mottled? Yes _____ No ☒ Gleyed? Yes _____ No ☒

Matrix Color: 10YR 2/1 Mottle Colors: _____

Other hydric soil indicators: _____

Is the hydric soil criterion met? Yes ☒ No _____

Rationale: _____

LOW CHROMA - HISTIC EPIPEDON

HYDROLOGY

Is the ground surface inundated? Yes _____ No ☒ Surface water depth: _____

Is the soil saturated? Yes ☒ No _____

Depth to free-standing water in pit/soil probe hole: SURFACE

List other field evidence of surface inundation or soil saturation.

Is the wetland hydrology criterion met? Yes ☒ No _____

Rationale: _____

OBSERVATION OF SOIL SATURATION

JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE

Is the plant community a wetland? Yes ☒ No _____

Rationale for jurisdictional decision: _____

ALL 3 CRITERIA MET

¹ This data form can be used for the Hydric Soil Assessment Procedure and the Plant Community Assessment Procedure.

² Classification according to "Soil Taxonomy."

DATA FORM
ROUTINE ONSITE DETERMINATION METHOD¹

Field Investigator(s): ALTMANN Date: 11-3-04
 Project/Site: TALL CHIEF State: WA County: PING
 Applicant/Owner: LANG Plant Community #/Name: _____
 Note: If a more detailed site description is necessary, use the back of data form or a field notebook.

Do normal environmental conditions exist at the plant community?

Yes X No _____ (If no, explain on back)

Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hydrology been significantly disturbed?

Yes _____ No X (If yes, explain on back)

VEGETATION

Dominant Plant Species	Indicator Status	Stratum	Dominant Plant Species	Indicator Status	Stratum
1. <u>Acer macrophyllum</u>	<u>FACU</u>	<u>T</u>	11. _____	_____	_____
2. <u>Rhamnus purshiana</u>	<u>FAC-</u>	<u>T</u>	12. _____	_____	_____
3. <u>Rubus spectabilis</u>	<u>FAC</u>	<u>S</u>	13. _____	_____	_____
4. <u>Polystichum munitum</u>	<u>FACU</u>	<u>S</u>	14. _____	_____	_____
5. <u>Tolmiea menziesii</u>	<u>FAC</u>	<u>H</u>	15. _____	_____	_____
6. <u>Rubus ursinus</u>	<u>FACU</u>	<u>V</u>	16. _____	_____	_____
7. _____	_____	_____	17. _____	_____	_____
8. _____	_____	_____	18. _____	_____	_____
9. _____	_____	_____	19. _____	_____	_____
10. _____	_____	_____	20. _____	_____	_____

Percent of dominant species that are OBL, FACW, and/or FAC 33%

Is the hydrophytic vegetation criterion met? Yes _____ No X

Rationale: _____

NOT > 50% FAC OR WETTER

SOILS

Series/phase: _____ Subgroup:² _____

Is the soil on the hydric soils list? Yes _____ No _____ Undetermined _____

Is the soil a Histosol? Yes _____ No X Histic epipedon present? Yes _____ No X

Is the soil: Mottled? Yes _____ No X Gleyed? Yes _____ No X

Matrix Color: 10YR 3/4 Mottle Colors: _____

Other hydric soil indicators: _____

Is the hydric soil criterion met? Yes _____ No X

Rationale: _____

HIGH CHROMA

HYDROLOGY

Is the ground surface inundated? Yes _____ No X Surface water depth: _____

Is the soil saturated? Yes _____ No X

Depth to free-standing water in pit/soil probe hole: _____

List other field evidence of surface inundation or soil saturation. _____

Is the wetland hydrology criterion met? Yes _____ No X

Rationale: _____

NO OBSERVATION OR EVIDENCE OF SOIL SATURATION OR PONDING

JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE

Is the plant community a wetland? Yes _____ No X

Rationale for jurisdictional decision: _____

NO CRITERIA MET

¹ This data form can be used for the Hydric Soil Assessment Procedure and the Plant Community Assessment Procedure.

² Classification according to "Soil Taxonomy."

DATA FORM
ROUTINE ONSITE DETERMINATION METHOD¹

Field Investigator(s): ACTMANN Date: 11-3-04
 Project/Site: TALL CHIEF State: WA County: KING
 Applicant/Owner: LANO Plant Community #/Name: _____
 Note: If a more detailed site description is necessary, use the back of data form or a field notebook.

Do normal environmental conditions exist at the plant community?

Yes X No _____ (If no, explain on back)

Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hydrology been significantly disturbed?

Yes _____ No X (If yes, explain on back)

VEGETATION

Dominant Plant Species	Indicator Status	Stratum	Dominant Plant Species	Indicator Status	Stratum
1. <u>Tsuga heterophylla</u>	<u>FACU-</u>	<u>T</u>	11. _____	_____	_____
2. <u>Acer circinatum</u>	<u>FAC-</u>	<u>T/S</u>	12. _____	_____	_____
3. <u>Corylus cornuta</u>	<u>FACU</u>	<u>S</u>	13. _____	_____	_____
4. <u>Polystichum munitum</u>	<u>FACU</u>	<u>S</u>	14. _____	_____	_____
5. _____	_____	_____	15. _____	_____	_____
6. _____	_____	_____	16. _____	_____	_____
7. _____	_____	_____	17. _____	_____	_____
8. _____	_____	_____	18. _____	_____	_____
9. _____	_____	_____	19. _____	_____	_____
10. _____	_____	_____	20. _____	_____	_____

Percent of dominant species that are OBL, FACW, and/or FAC 0

Is the hydrophytic vegetation criterion met? Yes _____ No X

Rationale: _____

NOT > 50% FAC OR WETTER

SOILS

Series/phase: _____ Subgroup:² _____

Is the soil on the hydric soils list? Yes _____ No _____ Undetermined _____

Is the soil a Histosol? Yes _____ No X Histic epipedon present? Yes _____ No X

Is the soil: Mottled? Yes _____ No X Gleyed? Yes _____ No X

Matrix Color: 10YR 3/3 Mottle Colors: _____

Other hydric soil indicators: _____

Is the hydric soil criterion met? Yes _____ No X

Rationale: _____

HIGH CHROMA

HYDROLOGY

Is the ground surface inundated? Yes _____ No X Surface water depth: _____

Is the soil saturated? Yes _____ No X

Depth to free-standing water in pit/soil probe hole: _____

List other field evidence of surface inundation or soil saturation. _____

Is the wetland hydrology criterion met? Yes _____ No X

Rationale: _____

NO OBSERVATION OR EVIDENCE OF SOIL SATURATION OR PONDING

JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE

Is the plant community a wetland? Yes _____ No X

Rationale for jurisdictional decision: _____

NO CRITERIA MET

¹ This data form can be used for the Hydric Soil Assessment Procedure and the Plant Community Assessment Procedure.

² Classification according to "Soil Taxonomy."

DATA FORM
ROUTINE ONSITE DETERMINATION METHOD¹

Field Investigator(s): ALTMANN Date: 11-3-04
 Project/Site: TALL CHIEF State: WA County: KING
 Applicant/Owner: LANG Plant Community #/Name: _____
 Note: If a more detailed site description is necessary, use the back of data form or a field notebook.

Do normal environmental conditions exist at the plant community?

Yes X No _____ (If no, explain on back)

Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hydrology been significantly disturbed?

Yes _____ No X (If yes, explain on back)

VEGETATION

Dominant Plant Species	Indicator Status	Stratum	Dominant Plant Species	Indicator Status	Stratum
1. <u>Thuja plicata</u>	<u>FAC</u>	<u>T</u>	11. _____	_____	_____
2. <u>Acer circinatum</u>	<u>FAC-</u>	<u>T/S</u>	12. _____	_____	_____
3. <u>Cornus cornuta</u>	<u>FACU</u>	<u>S</u>	13. _____	_____	_____
4. <u>Polystichum munitum</u>	<u>FACU</u>	<u>S</u>	14. _____	_____	_____
5. <u>Lysichiton americanum</u>	<u>OBL</u>	<u>H</u>	15. _____	_____	_____
6. <u>Athyrium filix-femina</u>	<u>FAC</u>	<u>H</u>	16. _____	_____	_____
7. _____	_____	_____	17. _____	_____	_____
8. _____	_____	_____	18. _____	_____	_____
9. _____	_____	_____	19. _____	_____	_____
10. _____	_____	_____	20. _____	_____	_____

Percent of dominant species that are OBL, FACW, and/or FAC 50%

Is the hydrophytic vegetation criterion met? Yes ~~___~~ No X

Rationale: NOT > 50% FAC OR WETTER

SOILS

Series/phase: _____ Subgroup:² _____
 Is the soil on the hydric soils list? Yes _____ No _____ Undetermined _____
 Is the soil a Histosol? Yes _____ No X Histic epipedon present? Yes X No _____
 Is the soil: Mottled? Yes _____ No X Gleyed? Yes _____ No X
 Matrix Color: 10YR 2/1 Mottle Colors: _____
 Other hydric soil indicators: _____
 Is the hydric soil criterion met? Yes X No _____
 Rationale: LOW CHROMA - HISTIC EPIPEDON

HYDROLOGY

Is the ground surface inundated? Yes _____ No X Surface water depth: _____
 Is the soil saturated? Yes X No _____
 Depth to free-standing water in pit/soil probe hole: SURFACE
 List other field evidence of surface inundation or soil saturation. _____

Is the wetland hydrology criterion met? Yes X No _____

Rationale: OBSERVATION OF SOIL SATURATION

JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE

Is the plant community a wetland? Yes X No _____

Rationale for jurisdictional decision: SOILS AND HYDROLOGY CRITERIA MET

¹ This data form can be used for the Hydric Soil Assessment Procedure and the Plant Community Assessment Procedure.

² Classification according to "Soil Taxonomy."

DATA FORM
ROUTINE ONSITE DETERMINATION METHOD¹

Field Investigator(s): ALTMANN Date: 11-3-04
 Project/Site: TALL CHIEF State: WA County: KING
 Applicant/Owner: LANG Plant Community #/Name: _____
 Note: If a more detailed site description is necessary, use the back of data form or a field notebook.

Do normal environmental conditions exist at the plant community?

Yes ☒ No _____ (If no, explain on back)

Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hydrology been significantly disturbed?

Yes ☒ No _____ (If yes, explain on back) HISTORIC FILL SLOPE

VEGETATION

Dominant Plant Species	Indicator Status	Stratum	Dominant Plant Species	Indicator Status	Stratum
1. <u>Rubus discolor</u>	<u>FACU</u>	<u>S</u>	11. _____	_____	_____
2. <u>Sambucus racemosa</u>	<u>FACU</u>	<u>S</u>	12. _____	_____	_____
3. <u>Phalaris amabilis</u>	<u>FACW</u>	<u>H</u>	13. _____	_____	_____
4. <u>Convolvulus</u>	<u>NL</u>	<u>V</u>	14. _____	_____	_____
5. _____	_____	_____	15. _____	_____	_____
6. _____	_____	_____	16. _____	_____	_____
7. _____	_____	_____	17. _____	_____	_____
8. _____	_____	_____	18. _____	_____	_____
9. _____	_____	_____	19. _____	_____	_____
10. _____	_____	_____	20. _____	_____	_____

Percent of dominant species that are OBL, FACW, and/or FAC 25%

Is the hydrophytic vegetation criterion met? Yes _____ No ☒

Rationale: _____

NOT > 50% FAC OR WETTER

SOILS

Series/phase: _____ Subgroup:² _____

Is the soil on the hydric soils list? Yes _____ No _____ Undetermined _____

Is the soil a Histosol? Yes _____ No ☒ Histic epipedon present? Yes _____ No ☒

Is the soil: Mottled? Yes _____ No ☒ Gleyed? Yes _____ No ☒

Matrix Color: FILL SLOPE Mottle Colors: _____

Other hydric soil indicators: _____

Is the hydric soil criterion met? Yes _____ No ☒

Rationale: _____

FILL SLOPE

HYDROLOGY

Is the ground surface inundated? Yes _____ No ☒ Surface water depth: _____

Is the soil saturated? Yes _____ No ☒

Depth to free-standing water in pit/soil probe hole: _____

List other field evidence of surface inundation or soil saturation. _____

Is the wetland hydrology criterion met? Yes _____ No ☒

Rationale: _____

NO OBSERVATION OR EVIDENCE OF SOIL SATURATION OR PONDING

JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE

Is the plant community a wetland? Yes _____ No ☒

Rationale for jurisdictional decision: _____

NO CRITERIA MET

¹ This data form can be used for the Hydric Soil Assessment Procedure and the Plant Community Assessment Procedure.

² Classification according to "Soil Taxonomy."

DATA FORM
ROUTINE ONSITE DETERMINATION METHOD¹

Field Investigator(s): ALTMANN Date: 11-3-04
 Project/Site: TALL CHIEF State: WA County: KING
 Applicant/Owner: LANG Plant Community #/Name: _____
 Note: If a more detailed site description is necessary, use the back of data form or a field notebook.

Do normal environmental conditions exist at the plant community?

Yes X No _____ (If no, explain on back)

Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hydrology been significantly disturbed?

Yes _____ No X (If yes, explain on back)

VEGETATION

Dominant Plant Species	Indicator Status	Stratum	Dominant Plant Species	Indicator Status	Stratum
1. <u>Salix lasiandra</u>	<u>FACW</u>	<u>T</u>	11. _____	_____	_____
2. <u>Alnus rubra</u>	<u>FAC</u>	<u>T</u>	12. _____	_____	_____
3. <u>Cornus sericea</u>	<u>FACW</u>	<u>S</u>	13. _____	_____	_____
4. <u>Rubus discolor</u>	<u>FACU</u>	<u>S</u>	14. _____	_____	_____
5. <u>Phalaris arundinacea</u>	<u>FACW</u>	<u>H</u>	15. _____	_____	_____
6. <u>Carex obnupta</u>	<u>OBL</u>	<u>H</u>	16. _____	_____	_____
7. <u>Athyrium filix-femina</u>	<u>FAC</u>	<u>H</u>	17. _____	_____	_____
8. _____	_____	_____	18. _____	_____	_____
9. _____	_____	_____	19. _____	_____	_____
10. _____	_____	_____	20. _____	_____	_____

Percent of dominant species that are OBL, FACW, and/or FAC 86%

Is the hydrophytic vegetation criterion met? Yes X No _____

Rationale: _____

> 50% FAC or WETTER

SOILS

Series/phase: _____ Subgroup:² _____

Is the soil on the hydric soils list? Yes _____ No _____ Undetermined _____

Is the soil a Histosol? Yes _____ No X Histic epipedon present? Yes _____ No X

Is the soil: Mottled? Yes X No _____ Gleyed? Yes _____ No X

Matrix Color: 10YR 4/1 Mottle Colors: VARIOUS

Other hydric soil indicators: _____

Is the hydric soil criterion met? Yes X No _____

Rationale: _____

LOW CHROMA - MOTTLES

HYDROLOGY

Is the ground surface inundated? Yes _____ No X Surface water depth: _____

Is the soil saturated? Yes X No _____

Depth to free-standing water in pit/soil probe hole: SURFACE

List other field evidence of surface inundation or soil saturation. _____

Is the wetland hydrology criterion met? Yes X No _____

Rationale: _____

OBSERVATION OF SOIL SATURATION

JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE

Is the plant community a wetland? Yes X No _____

Rationale for jurisdictional decision: _____

ALL 3 CRITERIA MET

¹ This data form can be used for the Hydric Soil Assessment Procedure and the Plant Community Assessment Procedure.

² Classification according to "Soil Taxonomy."

DATA FORM
ROUTINE ONSITE DETERMINATION METHOD¹

Field Investigator(s): ALTMANN Date: 11-3-04
 Project/Site: TALL CHIEF State: WA County: KING
 Applicant/Owner: LANG Plant Community #/Name: _____
 Note: If a more detailed site description is necessary, use the back of data form or a field notebook.

Do normal environmental conditions exist at the plant community?

Yes ☒ No _____ (If no, explain on back)

Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hydrology been significantly disturbed?

Yes _____ No ☒ (If yes, explain on back)

VEGETATION

Dominant Plant Species	Indicator Status	Stratum	Dominant Plant Species	Indicator Status	Stratum
1. <u>Phalaris arundinacea</u>	<u>FACW</u>	<u>H</u>	11. _____	_____	_____
2. _____	_____	_____	12. _____	_____	_____
3. _____	_____	_____	13. _____	_____	_____
4. _____	_____	_____	14. _____	_____	_____
5. _____	_____	_____	15. _____	_____	_____
6. _____	_____	_____	16. _____	_____	_____
7. _____	_____	_____	17. _____	_____	_____
8. _____	_____	_____	18. _____	_____	_____
9. _____	_____	_____	19. _____	_____	_____
10. _____	_____	_____	20. _____	_____	_____

Percent of dominant species that are OBL, FACW, and/or FAC 100%

Is the hydrophytic vegetation criterion met? Yes ☒ No _____

Rationale: > 50% FAC OR WETTER

SOILS

Series/phase: _____ Subgroup:² _____

Is the soil on the hydric soils list? Yes _____ No _____ Undetermined _____

Is the soil a Histosol? Yes _____ No ☒ Histic epipedon present? Yes _____ No ☒

Is the soil: Mottled? Yes ☒ No _____ Gleyed? Yes _____ No ☒

Matrix Color: 10YR 3/1 Mottle Colors: VARIOUS

Other hydric soil indicators: _____

Is the hydric soil criterion met? Yes ☒ No _____

Rationale: LOW CHROMA - MOTTLES

HYDROLOGY

Is the ground surface inundated? Yes _____ No ☒ Surface water depth: _____

Is the soil saturated? Yes ☒ No _____

Depth to free-standing water in pit/soil probe hole: SURFACE

List other field evidence of surface inundation or soil saturation.

Is the wetland hydrology criterion met? Yes ☒ No _____

Rationale: OBSERVATION OF SOIL SATURATION

JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE

Is the plant community a wetland? Yes ☒ No _____

Rationale for jurisdictional decision: ALL 3 CRITERIA MET

¹ This data form can be used for the Hydric Soil Assessment Procedure and the Plant Community Assessment Procedure.

² Classification according to "Soil Taxonomy."

DATA FORM
ROUTINE ONSITE DETERMINATION METHOD¹

Field Investigator(s): ALTMANN Date: 11-3-04
Project/Site: TALL CHIEF State: WA County: KING
Applicant/Owner: LANO Plant Community #/Name: _____
Note: If a more detailed site description is necessary, use the back of data form or a field notebook.

Do normal environmental conditions exist at the plant community?

Yes X No _____ (If no, explain on back)

Has the vegetation, soils, and/or hydrology been significantly disturbed?

Yes _____ No X (If yes, explain on back)

VEGETATION

Dominant Plant Species	Indicator Status	Stratum	Dominant Plant Species	Indicator Status	Stratum
1. <u>Acer macrophyllum</u>	<u>FACU</u>	<u>T</u>	11. _____	_____	_____
2. <u>Rubus discolor</u>	<u>FACU</u>	<u>S</u>	12. _____	_____	_____
3. <u>Phalaris grandinacea</u>	<u>FACW</u>	<u>H</u>	13. _____	_____	_____
4. _____	_____	_____	14. _____	_____	_____
5. _____	_____	_____	15. _____	_____	_____
6. _____	_____	_____	16. _____	_____	_____
7. _____	_____	_____	17. _____	_____	_____
8. _____	_____	_____	18. _____	_____	_____
9. _____	_____	_____	19. _____	_____	_____
10. _____	_____	_____	20. _____	_____	_____

Percent of dominant species that are OBL, FACW, and/or FAC 33%

Is the hydrophytic vegetation criterion met? Yes _____ No X

Rationale:

NOT > 50% FAC OR WETTER

SOILS

Series/phase: _____ Subgroup:² _____

Is the soil on the hydric soils list? Yes _____ No _____ Undetermined _____

Is the soil a Histosol? Yes _____ No X Histic epipedon present? Yes _____ No X

Is the soil: Mottled? Yes _____ No X Gleyed? Yes _____ No X

Matrix Color: 10YR 2/2 Mottle Colors: _____

Other hydric soil indicators: _____

Is the hydric soil criterion met? Yes _____ No X

Rationale:

CHROMA OF 2 WITHOUT MOTTLES

HYDROLOGY

Is the ground surface inundated? Yes _____ No X Surface water depth: _____

Is the soil saturated? Yes _____ No X

Depth to free-standing water in pit/soil probe hole: _____

List other field evidence of surface inundation or soil saturation.

Is the wetland hydrology criterion met? Yes _____ No X

Rationale:

NO OBSERVATION OR EVIDENCE OF SOIL SATURATION OR PONDING

JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION AND RATIONALE

Is the plant community a wetland? Yes _____ No X

Rationale for jurisdictional decision:

NO CRITERIA MET

¹ This data form can be used for the Hydric Soil Assessment Procedure and the Plant Community Assessment Procedure.

² Classification according to "Soil Taxonomy."